

Ta "hungry for meat". Although empirical data are not available, it is my
 262 impression that meat is (and was in the past) just as scarce in Tenetehara
 Te villages, and during the rainy season fish are extremely difficult to catch.
 262 The Tenetehara, with roughly the same food supply as the Tapirapá, do
 168 not feel called upon to impose drastic limitations upon the family size.
 Ta Population control among the Tapirapá seems not to result from a direct
 168 limitation imposed by food supply but from culturally derived values. In
 183 other words, although family limitation among the Tapirapá has a basis in
 262 subsistence, it does not derive from a minimum starvation situation. Family
 limitation seems to be related to a desire for a specific food, which the
 organism needs but which is also selected by Tapirapá culture as particu-
 larly desirable.

Ta This population policy of the Tapirapá with its explicit concept of
 161 maximum family size and the use of infanticide to limit the number of
 168 children must have maintained Tapirapá population in aboriginal times on
 182 a stable level. Even then, the balance between a stable and a declining
 [165] population must have been a delicate one. With an increase in the death-
 rate from new disease for which they did not have an acquired immunity,
 this delicate equilibrium was thrown off balance. After Luso-Brazilian
 contact, the population declined rapidly. Tapirapá concepts of population
 limitation remained unchanged in face of modified circumstances and fami-
 lies were not large enough to replace the adult population. The less rigid
 Te population policy of the Tenetehara was conducive to a large population
 161 during aboriginal times and it made the Tenetehara less vulnerable than
 168 the Tapirapá to modifications in the external environment. Without doubt
 182 numerous Tenetehara died from new diseases, from war, and from slavery
 [165] after contact with Luso-Brazilians, but their desire for large families must
 have allowed them to replace their population in at least sufficient numbers
 to survive until they were able to adjust to the new circumstances.

Te Secondly, differences in social structure between the two tribes were
 Ta also important in determining aboriginal population size as well as popula-
 596 tion trends after Luso-Brazilian contact. An extended family based upon at
 591 least temporary multifocal residence and a widely extended bilateral kin
 612 group were basic social groupings of both the Tapirapá and the Tenetehara
 in aboriginal times. Tenetehara social structure was in fact limited to the
 extended family and the bilateral kin group. The Tapirapá, on the other
 Ta hand, also had two other sets of social groups which were lacking in Tene-
 616 tetehara society. First, there were patrilineal ceremonial moieties limited to
 561 men. Each moiety was divided into three age-grades — boys, young men
 or warriors, and older men. Second, both men and women among the Ta-
 pirapá belonged to one of eight "Feast Groups" which were non-exogamous.
 476 Membership in these "Feast Groups" was patrilineal for men and matrilineal
 264 for women, although these rules were often modified by the personal desir-
 574 es of a parent. Both Tapirapá men's moieties and age grades and the
 616 "Feast Groups" were basic to all ceremonials and important in economic
 [796] production and distribution. The masked dances with impersonation of
 [535]

Te
182
[796]
[22] of numbers. Ceremonials in 1940 had not been abandoned but they were performed in an attenuated and disheartened manner. There was little motivation to accumulate the meat, the forest fruits, and the garden products which important ceremonials require among the Tapirapé.

Te
476
796
586
182
Te
[177] Ceremonials and cooperative economic activities in Tenetehara society are organized by extended family and kin groups. Lack of numbers, of course, creates difficulties in carrying out ceremonials and in organizing economic activities but it does not have the effect of disorganizing the society. Cooperation of large extended families in gardening and in collecting babassu nuts and copaliba oil is still the general pattern among the Tenetehara. Tenetehara social structure was malleable to change. Adjustment to new circumstances after Luso-Brazilian contact must have been easier for the Tenetehara than for the Tapirapé.

Te
Ta
161
182
183
105
571 This brief comparison of the cultural values and of those aspects of social structure of the Tenetehara and of the Tapirapé in terms of their effect upon population size and on population trends after Luso-Brazilian contact suggest several general hypotheses. First, the available information concerning the population size of these two tribes in aboriginal times indicates that the Tenetehara were much more numerous than the Tapirapé. Yet both tribes were tropical forest peoples with roughly similar technological equipment. It seems to the writer that this difference in population size between the two tribes was functionally related to ideological values and to social structure and not to differences in technology and environment. In other words, such differences in population can hardly be interpreted strictly in Malthusian terms. While population potentials are certainly limited by food supply, the level of technology, the application of medical knowledge, and other material factors, social institutions and culturally derived values are influential in determining trends in population size within the limits set by such "natural" factors.

Te
[797] Second, the social structure and the cultural values of any society are functionally related to a given population level. With change in population size, both the cultural values regarding population size and social structure must be adjusted. The Tapirapé concept of family size remained unchanged in face of modified conditions (i.e. higher death-rate caused by foreign disease) with the result that the adult population was no longer replaced by births. A rapidly declining population disrupted Tapirapé socio-ceremonial organization and affected the internal system of production and distribution. The Tenetehara with a more malleable social structure than that of the Tapirapé were able to survive the initial impact of Luso-Brazilian contact until the protection of the Jesuits allowed them to make necessary adjustments to the new circumstances.

Te
Ta
171
161
182
571 Finally, this comparison between the Tapirapé and the Tenetehara calls to mind other primitive societies whose social structure must have been functionally related to population level and to demographic trends in face of European civilization. In Brazil, the Ramakomekra (Eastern Timbira) with their complex moiety system and the Apinawé with their life marriage